

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/686,417	STOLLENWERK ET AL.
	Examiner Lawrence D Ferguson	Art Unit 1774

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Lawrence D Ferguson. (3) _____.

(2) Gunther Evanina. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 September 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,21 and 25.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner indicated in claim 25 'magnetron sputtering is chosen as sputtering method' and is dependent upon claim 1, which lacks mention of a sputtering method. Applicant agreed to an Examiner's Amendment changing dependency of claim 25 from claim 1 to claim 21.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required